



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/629,469	07/28/2000	Toshio Ota	084335-0123	3856

22428 7590 04/04/2005

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

SMITH, CAROLYN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/629,469

Applicant(s)

OTA ET AL

Examiner

Carolyn L. Smith

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19-23, 28, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17 and 19-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 28, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19-23, 28, 37, 39, 41, 43, and 45 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01032005.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

JLC

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's remarks, filed 3/01/05, are acknowledged.

Applicant's arguments, filed 3/01/05, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 28, 37, 39, 41, 43, and 45 are herein under examination.

PATENTABLE UTILITY GUIDELINES

The pending claims have been reviewed in light of the Utility Examination Guidelines and Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1092-1111, Friday, January 5, 2001.

The examiner is using the following definitions in evaluating the claims for utility.

"Specific" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention.

"Substantial" - A utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities.

"Credible" - Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record that is probative of the applicant's assertions. That is, the assertion is an inherently unbelievable undertaking or involves implausible scientific principles.

"Well-established" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 28, 37, 39, 41, 43, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility or, in the alternative, a well-established utility.

This rejection is maintained and reiterated for reasons of record.

These claimed polynucleotides, vectors, and transformants are not supported by a substantial utility, because no substantial utility has been adequately established for the claimed subject matter. SEQ ID NO: 702, 6223, 10847, and 10848 may be involved in the asserted protein functions, such as those described in pages 216-241, but the mere fact that these are only asserted functions supports the notion that further research would be required to confirm a “real world” context of use.

Applicant should explicitly identify a specific, substantial, and credible utility for the claimed invention and establish a probative relation between any evidence of record and the originally disclosed properties of the claimed invention.

Due to a lack of either an art recognized or alleged well established utility, the instant invention has been rejected due to also lacking the required combination of a specific, substantial, and credible utility. Although it may be credible that the polynucleotides involved in the claimed polynucleotides, vectors, and transformants may have an important function, the lack of a specific and substantial utility, as explained above, sufficiently supports this rejection.

Art Unit: 1631

It is noted that applicant has conducted homology studies (via BLAST, page 2 lines 30-32 and 39-48) to sequences which are known in the prior art and which has a stated sequence similarity or dissimilarity to the claimed sequence to identify predictive functions. Absent factual evidence, one skilled in the art would have reason to doubt that sequence similarity alone would reasonably support the assertion that the biological activity of the claimed subject matter would be the same as that of the similar sequence. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the similar sequence identified in the prior art has actually been tested for the biological activity or whether this also is an asserted biological activity based upon sequence similarity to yet a different sequence. Note that it would have been well known in the art that sequence similarity does not reliably correlate to structural similarity and that structural similarity does not reliably result in similar or identical biological activities. For example, it would have been well known that even a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation can destroy the function of the biomolecule in many instances, albeit not in all cases. In the absence of factual evidence characterizing the structural and functional components of the biomolecule, the effects of these changes are largely unpredictable as to which ones will have a significant effect and which ones will be silent mutations having no effect. Several publications document the unpredictability of the relationship between sequence, structure, and function, although it is acknowledged that certain specific sequences have been found to be conserved in biomolecules having related function following a significant amount of further research. See Lopez et al. (Molecular Biology, 32:881-891, 1999); Attwood (Science, 290:471-473, 2000); Gerhold et al. (BioEssays, 18(12):973-981, 1996); Wells et al. (Journal of Leukocyte Biology, 61(5):545-550, 1997); and Russell et al.

Art Unit: 1631

(Journal of Molecular Biology, 244:332-350, 1994). However, this level of factual evidence is absent here.

Applicants state that there is no reason to expect that in vitro results would differ from in vivo results. This statement is acknowledged. The point the Examiner was making was that for an assertion to be adequately supported such as an association to diabetes, a direct correlation of cells from normal versus diabetic patients (regardless of in vivo or in vitro practices) would provide adequate support. Applicants state various correlations and attempt to link these correlations (i.e. glycated albumin reduces expression levels of nephrin, glycated albumin effects has diabetic effects on diabetes, nephrin is reduced in glomeruli of patients); however, they fail to state work done on the claimed sequence that would provide adequate support for the asserted associations. Without such support, the lack of utility is maintained. It appears that further research would be necessary to determine if such asserted associations exist with the claimed polynucleotide to support a “real world” utility.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986) and reiterated by the Court of Appeals in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 at 1404 (CAFC 1988). The

Art Unit: 1631

factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. The Board also stated that although the level of the skill in molecular biology is high, the results of experiments in genetic engineering are unpredictable. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case are discussed below.

LACK OF ENABLEMENT

Claims 28, 37, 39, 41, 43, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the claimed invention.

This rejection is maintained and reiterated for reasons of record.

Since the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility or a well-established utility for the reasons set forth above (refer to the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection), one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Additional evidence supporting the assertions made by Applicants in the 35 USC 101 rebuttal may overcome this enablement rejection, if a substantial utility is adequately supported by additional evidence regarding the significant expression change differences between diseased and normal genes.

Applicants state their rebuttal of the 35 USC 101 rejection proved the present invention has a specific, substantial, and credible utility as a potential diagnostic marker and a research tool

Art Unit: 1631

for investigating the pathogenic effects of glycated proteins. This statement is found unpersuasive as the 35 USC 101 rejection is maintained due to unpersuasive arguments.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR §1.6(d)). The Central Fax Center number for official correspondence is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn Smith, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0721. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8 A.M. to 6:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached on (571) 272-0718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner Tina Plunkett whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

March 29, 2005

Ardin H. Marschel 3/29/05
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER